UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,926	10/13/2004	Suzanne Berlin	03292.102030	5925

66569   7590   07/23/2007

FITZPATRICK CELLA (AMEX)
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER
TSUI, WILSON W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>05 July 2007</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>18-27</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>18-27</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>13 October 2004</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the after-final filed on: 07/05/2007.

2.   Claims 1-17 have been cancelled. Claims 18-27 are currently pending. Claims

18, 23 are independent claims.

3.   Prior rejections, under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al, in

view of Meyer (with respect to claims 18-27) are withdrawn, since applicant's arguments

were persuasive.

Drawings

4.   The drawings filed on: 10/13/2004 are accepted.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 18-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Davis et al (US Patent: 7076728, Issued: Jul. 11, 2006, filed: Dec. 22, 2000), in further

view of Ferrel et al (US Patent: 5,860,073, issued: Jan. 12, 1999, filed: Jul. 17, 1995).

With regards to claim 18, Davis et al teaches a method comprising:

Obtaining an XML tag identifying a selected webpage interface element, wherein the

XML tag is utilized in a plurality of webpages to identify a plurality of occurrences of the

selected webpage interface element (column 9, lines 25-46: whereas, an XML tag is

obtained, such that each XML tag identifies a selected webpage interface

element/fragment)

Accessing a configuration file corresponding to the XML tag (column 9, lines 25-46:

whereas a style sheet file is referenced by a fragment), *wherein the configuration file*

provides data formatting rules for the selected webpage interface element (column 22,

lines 5-10: whereas formatting rules are in a style sheet for a web interface element),

based on the XML tag (column 1, lines 35-54: whereas rules are applied with respect to

xml markup)

Formatting rules from the configuration file changes an appearance of the selected

webpage interface element in the plurality of web pages (column 1, lines 35-54, and

column 22, lines 5-10: whereas formatting rules in a stylesheet/configuration-file

changes the appearance of the web interface element).

However, Davis et al does not expressly teach:

Editing the configuration file to change the data formatting rules for the selected web

page interface element, and wherein the changed data formatting rules resulting from

the edited configuration file changes an appearance of the selected webpage interface

element in the plurality of web pages.

Ferrel teaches *editing the configuration file to change the data formatting rules for the*

selected page element (column 7, lines 19-27: whereas a stylesheet/configuration file

can be edited to change the formatting rules of a page element).

Wherein the changed data formatting rules resulting from the edited configuration file

changes an appearance of the selected page interface element in a plurality of pages

(column 7, lines 19-27: whereas, a stylesheet/configuration file that is edited, will update the appearance of a page element).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Davis et al's configuration file/XSL file, such that the configuration file can be modified, as taught by Ferrel. The combination of Davis et al, and Ferrel would have allowed Davis et al to have reduced 'the difficulty to update the styles of objects [such that] the content of the information is separated from the layout' (Ferrel, column 3, lines 1-6).

With regards to claim 19, which depends on claim 18, Davis et al teaches *storing a plurality of configuration files corresponding to the plurality of web pages in a database* (column 9, lines 25-46: whereas a plurality of stored stylesheets/configuration-files correspond to a plurality of web pages).

With regards to claim 20, which depends on claim 20, Davis et al and Ferrel teach *editing the configuration* file, as similarly explained in the rejection for claim 20. Additionally, Davis et al teaches determining a *file type of the XML tag, wherein the editing of the configuration file is based on the determined file type of the XML tag* (whereas a configuration file/DTD is edited to specify/identify the type of fragment (specified through XML, as explained in column 10, lines 6-20), that includes compound fragments (such that a compound fragment can include/refer to file types such as HTML).

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Davis et al, and Ferrel's configuration file, such that the

configuration file would also include the use of a DTD to specify a type data, as also

taught by Davis et al. The combination of Davis et al and Ferrel would have allowed

Davis et al to have 'specified the appropriate document type' (Ferrel, column 10, line

11).

With regards to claim 21, which depends on claim 20, Davis et al teaches *wherein the*

file type is one of JSP, HTML, ASP and PHP, as similarly explained in the rejection for

claim 20, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 22, which depends on claim 18, Davis et al teaches *wherein the*

selected webpage interface element is one of: a user-input field; a graphics box, a

button, a check box, a radio box, a text field, a menu, a list, and a drop-down box

(column 11, lines 18-39: whereas a selected web page interface element includes

checkboxes/check marks, and drop-down boxes/menus).

With regards to claim 23, Davis et al teaches a system comprising:

A processor, a memory, and control logic (column 4, lines 45-67).

Additionally, Davis et al and Ferrel teach ... causing the processor to:

Obtain an XML tag identifying a selected webpage interface element, wherein the XML

tag is utilized in a plurality of webpages to identify a plurality of occurrences of the

selected webpage interface element; access a configuration file corresponding to the

XML tag, wherein the configuration file provides data formatting rules for the selected

webpage interface element, based on the XML tag; and edit the configuration file to

change the data formatting rules for the selected webpage interface element, wherein

the changed data formatting rules resulting from the edited configuration file changes an

appearance of the selected webpage interface element in the plurality of webpages, as

similarly explained in the rejection for claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 24, which depends on claim 23, for a system performing a method

similar to the method of claim 19 is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 25, which depends on claim 23, for a system performing a method

similar to the method of claim 20, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 26, which depends on claim 25, for a system performing a method

similar to the method of claim 21, is rejected under similar rationale.

With regards to claim 27, which depends on claim 23, for a system performing a method

similar to the method of claim 22, is rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments, page 7, filed 07/05/2007, with respect to claims 18-27

have been fully considered and are persuasive. The previous 35 USC 103(a) rejection

as being unpatentable over Davis et al, in further view of Meyer, is withdrawn. A new 35

USC 103(a) rejection unpatentable under Davis et al, in further view of Ferrel is applied.

7.   With respect to claim 18, the applicant argues that the DTD of Meyer is not

edited, is correct, and previous rejection is withdrawn.

Conclusion

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Wilson Tsui whose telephone number is (571)272-7596.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Wilson Tsui
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2178
July 18, 2007

CESAR PAULA
PRIMARY EXAMINER